

had a response rate of 36%—far too low for accurate projections.

Claim #3: The demand for IT workers will double in the next 10 years and there will not be enough of a supply of U.S. workers to meet it.

Response: Who says we can't meet it? The demand for IT workers doubled over the last 10 years and it was satisfied right here in the U.S. by people from a wide variety of educational backgrounds. At least half of the jobs require a two-year college degree or less. Let the demand double again. With well-planned policies of training and education and the natural market response of Americans looking for good jobs that pay well, we will meet that demand again.

What is the ITAA's excuse for these bad numbers? Their only response is to stop "arguing over methodology" so we can fix a problem that they can't even document. Could it be that foreign workers are cheaper, and they are trying to pull one over on Congress so they can cut their costs?

Before we invite thousands of foreign workers in to take American jobs, the industry owes us some straight answers.

RON KLINK.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SESSIONS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HORN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SAXTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE PAYCHECK PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BOB SCHAFFER) is recognized for half the time between now and midnight, approximately 12½ minutes, as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight on the occa-

sion of this special order to speak about one of the most basic components of campaign finance reform that we have to deal with here in the present Congress and certainly throughout the country as well.

There has been a lot of talk, Mr. Speaker, about various ways and strategies to reinstitute a sense of fairness and confidence in our election laws among the American people. But while the discussions about limited campaign funds, about reporting requirements, about various strategies to disclose the campaign contributions and expenditures of candidates seems to be occupying the center of political debate on campaign finance reform, I believe there is a much more fundamental issue that we need to deal with, and that is known as the Paycheck Protection Act.

What happens today in a strategy to raise funds for various campaigns is that we have a number of organizations that have found creative ways to withdraw the wages of hard-working Americans and siphon those dollars off for political causes of various sorts. Now, this often occurs without the consent or even the knowledge of the wage earner, who is working hard to earn the cash to make all this possible.

It occurs in many different settings, but most generally the biggest culprit seems to be labor unions. Labor unions persuade prospective employees to join their organizations for a variety of very attractive causes. One would be agency representation and collective bargaining, for example. And while those are legitimate functions of labor unions, functions that I think most people would support and agree with, few people would agree that it is also a good idea to siphon a portion of a worker's wages associated with union dues or agency fees and divert those dollars toward political campaigns of various sorts, often campaigns that the union worker themselves, the wage earner themselves, do not support.

I want to offer a couple of examples that I think Members ought to consider. If we read today's headlines, for example, "Ex-Teamsters Official Indicted". This deals with just one labor union. There are several. And there are several that are very honorable and worthwhile organizations.

I am focusing on the one in yesterday's headline, being the Teamsters Union. This is in the Washington Times. "A Federal Grand Jury indicted the Teamsters former political director yesterday on charges of giving \$1.1 million in union funds to the Democratic Party, the AFL-CIO and liberal advocacy groups so they would launder portions into the reelection campaign of Teamsters President Ron Carey.

Now, the Committee on Education and the Workforce is investigating this particular scandal, particularly the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee therein under the leadership of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA). And what we are un-

covering in that committee is just disclosure after disclosure after disclosure and additional revelations about money laundering schemes through the Teamsters Union.

Now, here we have an example of union dues that are being used and misused and laundered to benefit certain political campaigns.

There are some people, no doubt within these organizations, that support these particular political activities and political causes. And for them this money laundering scheme is certainly to their advantage and to their benefit. But the vast majority of union members and certainly Teamsters Union members do not approve of money laundering. They do not approve of having pension funds and other funds diverted toward political causes of various sorts without their knowledge and without their consent.

Now, these are matters of a very different nature than the general campaigns that myself or other Members of this Congress engage in, or at the State legislative level or county commissioners level, at a local level back home, or on an issue advocacy basis.

But those second kinds of campaigns that I mentioned are also the kinds of campaigns that receive political funds from union dues and from the wages of hard-working Americans without the consent or knowledge of the wage earner.

It does not seem to be too difficult a question to ask nor to answer in America as follows: Should anyone be forced or compelled to contribute their hard-earned wages to a political campaign they do not support? I think the answer is clearly no. It is hard to believe that there is anyone in America who would answer in the affirmative when given such a question.

The most recent national polls on the subject, and I am referring to this chart here on my right which shows where public opinion registers on this particular topic. A recent poll by John McLaughlin and Associates asked Americans across the country whether they approved or disapproved of a new Federal law that would protect workers paychecks. In other words, a law that would prevent any organization, corporations or labor organizations from siphoning off a portion of a wage earner's paycheck and directing it towards politics without the consent of the wage earner. Would Americans support a Federal law that would protect paychecks and protect them from such a travesty?

Among all voters, 80 percent of the American people have told us that they support a law to that effect. Looking way over here on the chart, only 16 percent of the American voters believe that labor unions and other political groups ought to be able to siphon cash out of wage earners' paychecks without their consent.

Interestingly enough, those numbers are identical to what we find in union households. In fact, this poll oversampled union households throughout

America, and we found that the very members of the labor organizations who have abused their trust, 80 percent of union households also agree that there ought to be a law protecting the paychecks of wage earners.

Once again, only 16 percent of union households, looking at the bar here, 16 percent of union households believe that the law ought to continue as it is today and allow unions and other political organizations to, in fact, steal cash out of the wages and paychecks of honest, hard-working Americans.

When we survey the teachers' union, just to be more specific about unions, 84 percent of teachers' unions' members support the notion of paycheck protection, and 80 percent of all other nonunion families throughout the country support paycheck protection as well.

This is a significant number and a significant illustration of where the American people are on such a basic issue of fairness. Again, it is hard to believe that there are those anywhere in the country who support the notion of confiscating the wealth of the people who earn it and directing it toward the political causes of some political insider's choice, but, as we can see on the chart, there are a handful of folks in America that agree.

□ 2345

The question is who is in charge. Well, when this question was posed to this Congress just 1 month ago in these very terms, we relied on the judgment of these individuals, those who are supporting laws to protect paychecks. The judgments of the individuals who constitute the majority of Americans believe paychecks ought to be protected, and we proposed a bill on that basis.

Well, this Congress, believe it or not, Mr. Speaker, sided not with the 80 percent of the American taxpayers who believe that paychecks ought to be protected, this Congress sided with the 16 percent of the individuals who believe that it is acceptable and just to have labor unions and political insiders take cash out of workers' paychecks without their consent.

Now, there is a number of reasons for that. Obviously, there is something that is causing the Congress to listen to these people down here in the minority of instances and to ignore the voices of those who are in the majority category, speaking of 80 percent and 84 percent strengths. The only thing I can attribute that to is politics in general. Those dollars that make their way toward various political campaigns, it is quite possible that those dollars may have made their way to Congress on occasion.

The President of the United States, Bill Clinton, promised to veto the legislation should it ever make his desk. That, again, is a promise that was made, I believe, with full consultation of the labor unions who raise political dollars by confiscating it from the paychecks of hard-working Americans.

And that may also, I suspect, be the case with a number of Members of Congress, as well.

The political pressure that month was pretty intense, I have to admit. We could see a number of folks who constitute the 16 percent minority that I mentioned lobbying around the Capitol here. They were wearing their buttons, asking Members to vote against paycheck protection. And while those organizations may have scored a temporary victory here in the Congress and in the House of Representatives, I believe that they will not prevail when it comes to winning this battle on the street. And that battle is one that is going to take place, I assure my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, not here in Washington, D.C., perhaps, but in the great State of California, in the great State of Colorado, in the great State of Nevada.

This is a battle that has already been won, in the great State of Washington. It is a battle that has already been won at the legislative level in the great State of Michigan. It is a battle that is being pondered and considered in places like Ohio, and Maryland, and Florida, and South Dakota and several other States where workers are telling us with great consistency that they are fed up with a law that allows labor unions and other political organizations to actually reach into the pockets of hard-working Americans and siphon off a portion of their wages and divert it toward political campaigns without the consent of the wage-earner.

Well, I mentioned those States and the battles that are about to ensue in those States because those States have seen fit to either propose or begin to propose ballot initiatives to put these questions on the ballot for their constituents to consider come election time, come November, or, in the case of California, even earlier.

When given that choice, it seems to be pretty clear and the direction of these initiatives right now seems to suggest that the voice of the people, the voice of the families that I mentioned earlier, that 80 percent in the majority who wants paycheck protection, will in the end speak louder than the minority of individuals who find comfort and value in using those resources for their own political gain and political advantage.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RIGGS). If the gentleman from California (Mr. BOB SCHAFFER) would yield for a moment, the Chair would inform the gentleman that he may claim the remainder of the time between now and midnight and may proceed.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the use of compulsory union dues for political purposes violates the basic principle of voluntary political participation embodied in our Nation's Constitution.

In 1994, by way of example, 40 percent of union members voted for Repub-

licans, for my party. Yet in 1996, less than 10 percent of labor PAC dollars went to Republican candidates. Now, think about that. Forty percent of union members are voting for one particular party, yet 10 percent of those unions' political PAC contributions are going to the same party.

That means about 30 percent of the members who are working hard, paying the bills, and making all this political gamesmanship possible are not represented. Their hard-earned cash is siphoned off away from their paychecks and spent on political campaigns that they do not, in fact, support.

In Washington State, where 72 percent of the voters approved a paycheck protection initiative in 1992, over 40,000 union workers had the shackles of involuntary political participation broken. In other words, the people of Washington State enacted a paycheck protection mechanism that protected the paychecks of wage-earners that essentially said that union dues are off limits, that wages are off limits for political purposes unless you have the consent of the wage-earner.

Well, here is what happened in the State of Washington. Originally there were 48,000 members of the Washington Education Association, and they were forced to fund political activities against their will until this initiative passed, and again with the backing of 72 percent of the voters in the State of Washington. Well, the interesting answer to a very obvious question is, what happened? The answer is that after passage, only 8,000 people voluntarily succumbed to the union's political activities.

Let me go back and restate those numbers. Before the paycheck protection act in the State of Washington was enacted, 48,000 union members were forced, not just one union, this is the Washington Education Association, were forced to contribute to political activities against their will. After passage, only 8,000 voluntarily paid for unions' political activities.

Well, Congress can send that same message to these labor bosses that are reminiscent to the messages sent by the colonists to King George, "No taxes without representation."

Now, I characterize this activity as taxes for the following reason, because labor unions have been given a tremendous amount of authority under Federal and State laws to organize on union sites and on work sites and to go forward on collective bargaining and agency representation. And that is fine. That is a good thing. Those of us who support paycheck protection are not opposed to unions organizing. We are not opposed to unions being engaged in collective bargaining. We are not opposed to unions providing agency representation to people who work on a particular work site. In fact, we are not even opposed to labor unions being involved in political activities.

I think a union's political action committee, political expenditures are

fine. Under the first amendment and the whole concept of free speech and industrial democracy, union activity in politics is a good and healthy thing.

□ 2355

I wish to encourage that, not discourage that. But the real fundamental question comes down to how those dollars are raised. When you have these organizations that raise funds without the consent of those who are paying, I believe that it constitutes the full definition of a criminal activity, an activity that ought to be ended.

The debate really is not over here in Congress. As many of us know and have followed, the efforts to move campaign finance reform to the floor again for the second time are being met and warmly received by our Speaker and others in our leadership. There will be another attempt at trying to pass meaningful campaign finance reform in a few months. When that bill comes to the floor, we ought to insist and demand that paycheck protection be a part of those debates and those discussions. Fortunately for the 80 percent of the individuals who support paycheck protection, we are receiving very favorable indications from our leadership that that will be the case, that we will have an open floor scenario where amendments by Members will be able to be offered, including the Paycheck Protection Act, that the Paycheck Protection Act may in fact be folded into the base bill that comes to the floor for campaign finance reform. But more importantly, I think it is important for this Congress to utilize its opportunity for national leadership to speak out to the American people and to talk about the real travesty that exists and takes place every single day.

Mr. Speaker, most people really do not believe or do not understand that it is possible in America to have a portion of an individual's wages being siphoned off and spent on political causes without their knowledge and without their consent. If we can say that over and over and over again and allow people to understand really how sick politics has become at this particular level, I think that will give us the added impetus and the added incentive here in Washington to put the voice of the people ahead of the voices of those small special interests who use these political funds to their political advantage.

Oh, and it pays off. There is no question about that. Once again, I refer my colleagues to this chart. When you have 80 percent of the American people in every column, again, average voters in this column, union households in this column, 84 percent of teacher union households, 80 percent of non-union households, when you have those kinds of numbers of individuals who tell us that they want paycheck protection and yet the 16 percent of voters, the 16 percent of union members, the 13 percent of teacher union members and the 16 percent of nonunion

members who tell us that they do not want paycheck protection, and you realize that it is the small minority who wins the day here in Congress.

We can see very clearly that the political dollars that are spent to advance the causes of labor unions is paying off for labor unions. It is paying off for the 16 percent. But I am confident that throughout the country as more and more States begin to evaluate the question of labor union dues and paycheck protection, that we will see State after State after State siding on behalf of rank and file families, rank and file workers and union members in the end who would rather have their union dollars going toward union activities that are legitimate and on the work site, perhaps toward supporting their pensions.

If you are a member of the Teamsters Union, you realize that you are going to have to raise more money for your pension funds because of the theft that took place and the money laundering that took place to, in fact, drain the pension plan of the Teamsters Union at the national level, again which has resulted in the indictment of many high-ranking Teamsters officials and in the end resulted in past Teamsters President Ron Carey being invalidated and prohibited from seeking reelection to the post, essentially clearing the way for James Hoffa, Jr. to become President of the Teamsters Union.

When you see these kinds of scandals, if you are a member of the Teamsters Union, you realize that maybe you would rather have a greater portion of your union dues going toward repaying many of the expenses and costs associated with these internal crimes rather than seeing them going toward subsidizing campaigns and political organizations that they may not support.

Let me tell you about one of the individuals who testified before the Subcommittee on Employer and Employee Relations just last year, a man named Kerry Gipe, a union member who testified. He said, quote, I was told that joining the union was a mandatory part of working for the company and absolutely no money was allowed to be used from our union dues for political purposes.

Unfortunately for Mr. Gipe and millions of other American workers, labor bosses continue to use compulsory dues for political purposes. According to some estimates, unions spent as much as \$200 million in the 1996 election. All that the Paycheck Protection Act that was proposed here in Congress did was empower the individual worker. It was, in all candor, at the expense of the small number of union bosses who benefit from the funds of their members. Employees would decide under such a piece of legislation whether and to whom they contribute their hard-earned wages and that they could revoke that authorization at any time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a topic that we will discuss again and bring to the floor at other occasions over the course

of the next several months. It is a topic that will be discussed across the country in various States that are considering paycheck protection. Once again I am convinced that once we just lay out the very basic facts of this particular political scandal and evidence of corruption that exists in the country, that eventually we are going to answer properly and correctly and those 80 percent of individuals will finally have their voices heard.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

The following Members (at the request of Mr. KLINK) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. COYNE, today, for 5 minutes.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. KLINK, today, for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS, TODAY, FOR 5 MINUTES.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCKEON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. SESSIONS, today and April 30, for 5 minutes each.

Mr. HORN, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. SEXTON, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. RIGGS, today, for 5 minutes.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

The following Members (at the request of Mr. KLINK) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. KIND.

Mr. COYNE.

Mr. DICKS.

Mr. HOYER.

Mr. LANTOS.

Ms. KAPTUR.

Mr. DOYLE.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Ms. DELAUNO.

Mr. TORRES.

Mr. BONIOR.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

Mr. TOWNS.

Ms. FURSE.

Ms. NORTON.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

Mr. SKELTON.

Mr. VENTO.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

Mrs. KENNEDY of Connecticut.

Mr. BENTSEN.

Mr. CARDIN.

Mr. STARK.

Mr. BROWN of California.

Mr. KLECZKA.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts.

Mr. LEVIN.

Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCKEON) and to include extraneous matter: